IN THE HIGH OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(*Special Original Jurisdiction*)

THURSDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND SSEVEN

P R E S E N T

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. S. NARAYANA

* * *

WRIT PETITION No.18844 of 2007

Between:

Smt. S. Shyamala … Petitioner

Versus

The Joint Collector,
Chittoor,
Chittoor District & Ors. … Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri M . Venkataramana Reddy (1515)

Counsel for the Respondents: GP for Civil Supplies

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. S. NARAYANA

* * *

WRIT PETITION No.18844 of 2007

O R D E R

Sri M.Venkataramana Reddy the learned counsel representing the writ petitioner made elaborate submissions pointing out different averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the petition.

2. Sri V.Jagapati, however, would submit that the counsel had lodged caveat but the party who had been temporarily appointed had not been impleaded as party and the same is hereby recorded.

3. The Assistant Govt.Pleader for Civil Supplies takes notice on behalf of respondents 1 to 3.

4. The writ petition is filed to declare the action of the second respondent in issuing the proceedings ROC.No.1714/2007 dated 19-8-2007 as illegal, arbitrary, unjust, unsustainable, contrary to law and violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and consequently to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to continue the petitioner as fair price shop dealer of Mangunta village of S.R.Puram Revenue Mandal, Chittoor district and to pass such other suitable orders.

5. It is stated that the petitioner was appointed as fair price

shop dealer in the year 1995 and the petitioner has been distributing essential commodities to the cardholders for the last twelve years without any complaint whatsoever.

6. It is also stated that the second respondent basing on certain vague allegations suspended the petitioner and it is also further stated that aggrieved by the order of suspension made by the second respondent, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the first respondent in Appeal No.C-1/1128/07, dated 27-8-2007. It is also stated that the first respondent having admitted the appeal had not suspended the order of the second respondent. Hence, the present writ petition.

7. Several factual details had been narrated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition. It is not in serious controversy that the petitioner had already invoked the remedy by filing an appeal before the first respondent.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances, the first respondent is hereby directed to dispose of the appeal at the earliest point of time, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

9. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of at

the admission stage. No costs.

JUSTICE P . S.
NARAYANA .

06 / 9 / 2007

I s L

NB: Issue CC immediately

B/o. IsL